

Minutes of the Public Works Committee - July 20, 2006

The meeting was called to order at 8:30 a.m. by Chair Herro.

Present: Chair Ken Herro, County Board Supervisors Joe Marchese (arrived at 8:55 a.m.), Jeff Morris, Fritz Ruf, David Swan and Peter Wolff (arrived at 9:27 and left at 10:10 a.m.);

Absent: Karl Nilson

Staff Present: Legislative Policy Advisor Mark Mader, Committee Secretary S.Meisenheimer

Also Present: Public Works Director Rich Bolte, Engineering Services Mgr. Gary Evans, Architectural Services Mgr. Dennis Cerreta, Architectural Engineering Technician Mike Wells, Supervisor Bonnie Morris, Village of Sussex Assistant Administrator Jeremy Smith, Budget Specialist Linda Witkowski, Senior Civil Engineering Technicians Steve Brasch and Rick Harley, Senior Engineering Technician Peter Chladil, Senior Civil Engineers Karen Braun and Ed Hinrichs

Read Correspondence / Public Comment

1. Herro referred to the list of correspondence that the Executive Committee addressed at their meeting of July 17, 2006.
2. Ruf said he has received numerous phone calls requesting that the speed limit be lowered on Frog Alley (Highway SS) between Highways G and T. It is currently 55 mph and the residents in the neighborhood feel it is way out of line -- some want 35 mph; others want 45 mph. Ruf said he would support 45 mph. He has also received calls from the president and a number of the board members from the Village of Pewaukee, who support lowering the speed limit, as well as a letter from the Chief of Police of the City of Pewaukee requesting same. Ruf also received a specific request from former Lt. Governor Farrow asking that the timing of the stop lights at SS and T be examined because they seem to be extremely long between changes, and the same with the off ramp from Highway 16 to Highway T at WCTC.
3. Swan addressed 2 letters he received from Town of Oconomowoc Supervisor Tom Martin and from John Koepke of the Town of Oconomowoc regarding the property that is proposed to be rezoned to R-2 Residential and which is adjacent to the Peebles' farm.
4. Letter from Director Bolte to New Berlin Superintendent of Schools James Benfield in regard to CTH ES – Ronald Reagan Elementary School.
5. Letter from State Department of Corrections to Sheriff Trawicki in regard to the Waukesha County Huber Facility, 2006 Annual Inspection Report.

Approve Minutes of June 15, 2006

Motion: Ruf moved, second by J.Morris, to approve the minutes of 6/15/06. **Motion carried 4 – 0.**

Executive Committee Report by Ken Herro on the Meeting of July 17, 2006

Herro reviewed items that were discussed and/or considered at the last meeting on 7/17/06.

Report by Supervisor Genia Bruce on the Airport Commission Meeting of June 21, 2006 and Other Relevant Airport Issues

This item was held over.

Discuss Capital Project Background Leading to the Justice Facility Project, Phase 2, Capital

Mader gave a brief historical overview of events leading up to where the project is at this point. He stated that four or five years ago there was basically a capital planning process that addressed the jail

and the justice facility with a price tag on it. The recently completed jail occurred first. Next plans included the old jail being demolished (114 beds) and looking at the cost of the courthouse addition, which was primarily intended to house the criminal proceedings for the courts, with a price tag that was fairly significant. Then, the proposed courts addition went from 4 stories to 3 to 2, and all of those options were supposed to be evaluated. For the next transition it was decided to hold off for a year to see how the controlled access screening would work. The next concept was to see if some of the existing courtrooms near the jail could be used in concert with modifications for separate prisoner movement that would potentially cost a lot less and that appears to be where the project is now. He also indicated that evaluation of the capital and operating costs between all of the various options is absolutely critical for the committee to review.

Discuss Justice Facility Project, Phase 2, as Proposed in the Capital Plan and as Alternatively Proposed for a Courthouse/County Board Room Renovation

Cerreta stated had we not bid the project back in 2002/2003, it would never be affordable today. Cerreta distributed a packet (Phase I – Justice Center) containing the 5 alternatives/options (four floor option; four floor option with three floors finished/one shelled; three floor option with fourth floor expansion; three floor option with ½ floor shelled; and the two floor option with 1 court/1 commissioner floor, which he reviewed with the committee along with the costs page. Cerreta stated that the cost figures are about 18 months old but laid out in a simple way so you don't have to go through 30-40 pages. These figures are for the entire project and show total construction costs and total project costs. He stated there would be another escalation factor, which will include costs for bonds, architects, and engineers.

Cerreta distributed and reviewed another packet showing views of the new Justice Center (2nd and 3rd floors) and floor plans of proposed courts expansion and remodeling for the third floor of the courthouse, second floor of courthouse, fourth floor of courthouse, proposed 2nd intake court (ground floor–main jail), and proposed county board room in courtroom #187 on first floor of courthouse.

(Due to a scheduled agenda item, the committee will return to this agenda item later in the meeting.)

Discuss Use of Contractors' Equipment as Distinguished from Vehicle Use

Bolte and Smith were present. Supervisor Rob Hutton was unable to attend. Bolte said for many years the Village of Sussex has purchased salt that was stored at the Sussex substation. The issue is one of loading the salt on Village of Sussex trucks. There is only one loader at the substation, which is owned by the county and is not a complicated piece of equipment. If a county employee is not at the substation the Village has to wait anywhere from 1 minute to ½ hour for a county employee to come back to load the salt. Bolte said he is willing to let a Village of Sussex employee use the loader subject to some liability agreement between the village and the county and subject to training by the village employees.

Bolte stated that the county has a vehicle use policy which was put in place about 2 years ago that says only county employees can operate county vehicles. Bolte said he is willing to work with Laura Stauffer of Risk Management to get the policy modified. J.Morris said if we can work out a liability protection scheme that protects the county and is workable, he doesn't have a problem

with it. Marchese said he doesn't like the idea of someone operating the county loader. They cost \$150,000. He would like to see Sussex get their own salt shed or go with the Town of Lisbon. P.Wolff arrived at the meeting at 9:27 a.m.

Swan said it is important for communities to work together. Bolte said he doesn't see a downside to this. Swan said he would be in favor of a one-year experiment. Bolte said this is a relatively unique situation for a relatively large municipality. There are similar arrangements but not using a loader. Other communities buy salt from the county but in very small quantities, such as the Village of Nashotah and Village of North Prairie. Bolte indicated he would also present the issue to the Personnel Committee.

Herro said by consensus the committee agrees to give Bolte the authority to enter into an agreement with the Village of Sussex for a one-year trial period until August of 2007.

View Courthouse Areas Subject to Potential Renovation

At about 9:45 a.m. the committee, Cerreta, Wells, B. Morris, Witkowski and Mader went on a tour of the courthouse areas subject to potential renovation. Chairman Dwyer also joined the tour. Cerreta explained the various areas and answered questions as they proceeded on the tour. They viewed the existing County Board room and observed how the modifications would impact that area. Next the committee proceeded to view the modifications that would occur towards the south and east sides of the courthouse. The proposal includes building new courts on the existing roof of the courthouse. The committee completed the tour by viewing the potential County Board room, which would be in the current room C-167. During the tour, the committee referred to a document labeled "Proposed Courts Expansion and Remodeling," dated 4/9/06. Cerreta explained elements of the proposed project throughout the tour.

P.Wolff left after the tour at about 10:10 a.m.

Herro asked who is leading this? Cerreta said the Public Works Department is leading the design on the project. Also involved are Clerk of Courts Carolyn Evenson, Jail Administrator Mike Giese, Sheriff Dan Trawicki, and Judges Mac Davis and Mike Bohren. Cerreta said the project is on hold right now.

Review of Engineering Services Division

Evans gave an overview of the Engineering Division. He stated they design, construct and to some extent operate highways, which basically means they handle all access permitting and utility permitting. There are 396 center-line miles of highway and 1,000 lane miles. They issue about 100 access permits per year.

Herro asked how much the highway budget is. Evans said it is in the \$12 million to \$15 million range which is without federal funding. Federal funding amounts to about \$4 million. Herro asked what was the budget 10 years ago? Bolte replied it wasn't much different, but probably around \$12 million to \$14 million.

Evans introduced his staff and their responsibilities – Steve Brasch, Peter Chladil, Karen Braun, Rick Harley, Ed Hinrichs, Paul Barthel and Kevin Yanney.

Herro asked what is the purpose of a county road? Evans replied it is to transport traffic from one side of the county to the other. Local roads provide local access within the cities. Herro said SEWRPC just finished the 2035 plan. What is the biggest change to our county roads? Evans said one of the biggest changes is extending Highway V. The other major change is Barker Road to the north. Herro asked what about 2 lanes to 4 lanes? Evans said yes, the big one is Highway P in Oconomowoc.

Other areas Evans covered were: criteria for changing 2 lanes to 4 lanes (13,000 vehicles per day); various county highways and number of vehicles they handle; 78 miles in 2020 plan that should go from 2 lanes to 4 lanes in the county (only do 3 miles per year); and how often bridges are rebuilt (every 50 years or longer).

Herro asked how do you decide which 3 miles to do per year? Bolte said they look at the heaviest traffic and accident problems and at opportunities to partner with development, as well as consider community pressure or lack thereof. Herro asked is it the five-year repaving program that costs \$2.2 million? Bolte said \$2.2 million is per year. Their plan has been to repave every mile of county highway every 15 years but given the increase in asphalt prices, they may need to rethink this.

Ruf referred to his comments made earlier in the meeting regarding Frog Alley (Highway SS) between Highways G and T, and the timing of the stop lights at Highways SS and T which seem to be extremely long between changes, and the same with the off ramp from Highway 16 to T at WCTC. Barthel said all four of the signals in that location are working together and that is why the one at T and SS is taking longer because the idea is to get traffic off of Highway 16 -- get the green light off of Highway 16 at WCTC and down at Highway SS.

Herro asked how is road access on county highways regulated when there is development? Bolte said it is regulated by the County Board ordinance which is modeled after a State law. It says no entrance closer than 500' to the intersection of a county highway, and one access point for every 600' or fraction thereof of frontage; if there is 800' two access points are allowed. Ultimately, there has to be site distance.

Herro asked how are speed limits set and how a supervisor can get them changed. Bolte said philosophically they do not believe in speed limits per se. As traffic engineers they do not believe that speed limit signs mean a thing -- people drive at a speed they feel comfortable at. A study is done to determine what the prevailing speed is on a road. The practice that is in place is the 85th percentile speed. That is the speed that only 15% of the people are exceeding. It is the speed that 85% of the people are at or below. They will set a speed limit that is within 5 mph of that as their target. There are a couple of state statutes that control what they can do. They have discretion between 45 and 55 mph. To get lower than 45 mph, you need a certain level of development. Below 35 mph is all statutory limits, and they have no ability to reduce below 35 mph.

Bolte said they also look at the character of the area and at any other extenuating circumstances if there are any. Based on all factors, they will exercise engineering judgment and either recommend a speed limit change with an ordinance or write back to the requesting party saying they do not recommend that the speed be changed.

Status Update of Capital Projects

This item was held over.

Motion to adjourn: J.Morris moved, second by Swan, to adjourn the meeting at 12:12 p.m.
Motion carried 5 – 0.

Respectfully submitted,

Joe C. Marchese
Secretary

/sm